



0968/P/JO

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED

In re Application of:

Vladimir Nikolaevich PAK et al.

APR 0.4 2003

Serial No.:

09/885,645

Exam

Examiner: Susan Ungar

TECH CENTER 1600/2900 -

Filed:

June 20, 2001

8

§

§ § §

Group Art Unit: 1642

For: METHOD FOR TREATMENT OF MALIGNANT NEOPLASMS AND COMPLEX

PREPARATION HAVING ANTINEOPLASTIC ACTIVITY

BOX: NON-FEE AMENDMENT

Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited postage paid with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C.

m Merch 21, 2003

Signature

I ekha Gonalakrichnan

TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Transmitted herewith in the above-identified application are:

- 1) Response to Office Action mailed January 21, 2003-8 pages;
- 2) Petition for Extension of Time- 2 pages;
- 3) Check in the amount of \$55; and,
- 4) Acknowledgment Postcard.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account 10-0447 (Reference No. 53196-00002).

Docket No. 53196-00002 0968/P/JO

Respectfully submitted on Applicant's behalf,

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A Professional Corporation

Lekha Gopalakrishnan, Ph.D.

Leble Japahlouhon

Reg. No.: 46,733

Date: March 21, 2003

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200 Dallas, Texas 75202 Tel. (214) 965-7364 Fax (214) 855-4300 CONTROL OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF THE

034-07-03 LASVET

1642

Patent and Trademark Agency

Established 1992

March 31, 2003

Ms. Susan Ungar

Primary Patent Examiner Group Art Unit: 1642

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Washington, D.C. 20231

U.S.A.

YOUR REF:

09/885,645

OUR REF:

0968/P/JO

Re: U.S. Patent Application No. 09/885,645 filed on June 20, 2001

For: Method of treatment of malignant neoplasms and complex preparation

having antineoplastic activity

Dear Ms. Susan Ungar,

We are a Patent and Trademark Agency in Estonia, representing the applicants of the above patent application before USPTO. This is our first experience with USPTO.

We contact you directly for the reason that the response to the first Office Action filed with USPTO on October 31, 2002 remained without our explanation and objection as to the ground of rejection under MPEP § 806.05(h) arisen in the said Action. The objections, basing on MPEP § 803 and § 821.04, were not presented by us and this is not our vision of the case.

This time the response to the second Office Action filed with USPTO on March 21, 2003 has been prepared by us together with the applicants in such a form as we consider the problems under the question. The applicants have taken into account the advices and have attempted to respond to the rejections arisen.

Therefore we herewith again respectfully request you to reconsider the restriction requirement under § 806.05(h) in light of the explanations presented in the said response.

Very truly yours,

Wankry Milvi Vänikvet